

4
157
A572
AUG - 4 1938

Land policy REVIEW

Vol. I

JULY-AUGUST 1938

No. 2

Migrants and Resettlement in the Pacific Coast States

by DAVIS McENTIRE

The present flight of distressed farm families from the Great Plains to the Pacific coast adds a new chapter to the record of westward migration. It depicts, however, a phenomenon that may well be an historic one: for the first time a wave of migration has reached the shores of the Pacific only to find there the same poverty and lack of economic opportunity which had driven the migrants from their homes.

Recent migrations from the Plains began in substantial volume about 1932, when the convergence of drought and depression upon an unstable land-use system destroyed the means of support for thousands of farm families. Now mechanized farming methods are spreading rapidly in cotton-producing areas of the southern Great Plains, displacing more thousands of small farm owners, tenants and laborers.¹ After

¹ Paul S. Taylor, *Power Farming and Labor Displacement in the Cotton Belt*—*Monthly Labor Review*, March and April, 1938.

6 years of steady flow, the westward movement of displaced plainsmen shows no sign of tapering off. From July 1935 to the end of April in 1938, nearly 250,000 persons "in need of manual employment" entered California. During the first 4 months of this year, over 30,000 distressed migrants entered that State—which was 5,000 more than came in the same period of 1937. During the 18 months prior to July 1, 1937, more than 19,000 farm families moved into Washington, Oregon and Idaho, according to the Farm Security Administration.

Poor Land and Poor Jobs

The plight of these homeless farmers and the disruptive factor they constitute in their new locations have been widely discussed.² Settlement on the coast's land has been unsatisfactory both in numbers and results. A Farm Security Administration survey in July 1937 found that of the estimated 19,000 farm families entering the Pacific Northwest during the year and a half prior to July 1937, less than 12,000 had settled on the land up to the date of survey, and only about one-fourth of this number had succeeded in locating on good developed farms. Most of the new settlers have located either on poor, cheap farms which frequently had been abandoned by previous operators, or on undeveloped land. Large numbers of migrant families have settled on cut-over land which is costly to develop, often of low productivity even when cleared, and incapable of yielding more than the most meager livelihood for many years, if at all.

A large majority of the recent migrants have become seasonal laborers in agriculture, following the harvests from place to place, with no settled residence and without steady employment. Their entrance into this field has aggravated the chronic oversupply of agricultural labor and has led to a disastrous sharing of available work. Migrants live in overcrowded squatter camps on roadsides, ditch banks, and city dumps, without sanitary facilities, unable to afford medical care. The ordinary health-protective and medical services of the community are rarely available to nonresidents. Thus exposed to communicable diseases, the migrants constitute a health danger not only to themselves but to the communities with which they come in contact. Lack of proper food brings a high incidence of nutritional diseases among the children. Their educational opportunities are also extremely limited by the necessity for their supplementing the family income through work in the fields, and by the briefness of their stay in any one community.

² See "What Shall We Do With Them," by Paul S. Taylor, address before the Commonwealth Club of California, April 15, 1938, mimeo.; "Recent Migration Into the Pacific Northwest," Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission, May, 1938; "Migration to the Pacific Northwest and Social Planning," by Vernon A. Mund, paper presented before the Pacific Association, Claremont, California, Dec., 1937, mimeo.; "The Dust Farmer Goes West," by Neil Lane, *Land Policy Review*, May-June, 1938.



Migrant workers find clean and healthy tent grounds at FSA's Kern County Camp, California. (F. S. A. photo)

The Road Back Is No Way Out

Attempts to deal realistically with this problem of the impoverished migrants have been handicapped by highly emotional discussions in the press and by the extreme reluctance of local communities to receive peniless nonresidents. Except during the few weeks of peak employment in agriculture, the migrants are generally looked upon as an unwanted element in west coast communities, and considerable resentment has greeted efforts made to help the more wretched of these homeless people. Denial of relief, because of their nonresident status, has been coupled with more positive attempts to send the migrants "back where they came from." The failure of this approach—for the migrants have nothing to go back to—now emphasises the need for adopting a constructive program that will develop some opportunity of self-support for these impoverished wanderers.

Perhaps the most serious immediate aspect of the migrants' situation is their difficulty in getting relief. Theoretically, there are no residence requirements for employment on W. P. A. projects, but in practice local relief authorities are reluctant to certify nonresidents when quotas are seldom adequate to provide for all needy employable residents. Moreover, the relief authorities are alarmed over the continuing stream of destitute and near-destitute refugees from other States and are fearful that any relaxation of residence requirements will attract more migrants and lead to an impossible relief burden. The States from

which the migrants have come are no more able or anxious to handle the problem of their relief.

Needed—A Federal Program

For this reason, it is clear that any effective program to facilitate the assimilation of the migrants must be a national program, comprehending the interest of both the States who are losing this population-on-the-march, and the States which are receiving it. The attempts of west coast States to reverse the tide, to send back the migrants to their dust-blown acres or their vanished jobs, are futile. From a national standpoint there is not the slightest merit in attempting to return migrants to the places where they have legal residence unless such places are the ones where rehabilitation can be most effectively accomplished.

The migrants need, first of all, relief. Several bills have been introduced in Congress to provide Federal relief for migrants, but none of them has yet been passed. The only step in this direction has been the emergency action of the Farm Security Administration to provide cash grants and commodities to about 14,000 migrant families in California who reached the point of starvation during the past winter and spring.

F. S. A. Leads the Way

They need, too, emergency housing. The Farm Security Administration has made a beginning here in setting up seven labor camps in California. These have not only given the migrant workers clean and sanitary living conditions, but have served as medical centers and units of self-government and community enterprise. Yet these camps can serve only 1,400 families, out of the thousands who come by. Permanent housing in or near towns in agricultural districts where workers congregate in off-seasons, is also badly needed. An adequate housing program for agricultural workers must face a large element of public subsidy. Farm wage workers, which include most of the recent migrants, do not earn enough to pay rentals based on liquidation of costs of housing projects, and any attempt to meet costs of construction from rentals will inevitably squeeze out the farm worker and substitute better-paid groups able to pay rents commensurate with costs. A subsidized housing program for migratory agricultural workers is socially justifiable, if for no other reason than that a permanent abode is the foundation for any worthwhile education, health, or rehabilitation program. More important, it is also the foundation of participation in civic and community affairs.

A third major need of the migrants is organized medical care. Since the vast majority of them cannot afford the usual fees of private doctors, an intermediary must be provided for them. One such is the Agricultural Workers Health and Medical Association, incorporated under Californian laws and supplied with an initial grant of \$100,000 by the Farm Security Administration. The association does not employ physicians

on its regular staff, but utilizes doctors in private practice who agree to accept patients from the Association at a fixed charge. This work needs strengthening and widening if it is effectively to serve the whole army of migrants.

Exploring Settlement Opportunities

But, necessary as these programs are, they do not provide the answer to how the migrants are to be helped to support themselves.

Since many, perhaps the majority, of the migrants are farm people, the possibilities of resettling them on the land need to be thoroughly explored. Federal Reclamation projects now under construction will eventually make available for settlement about two and a half million acres of new land. The Columbia River Basin project alone will ultimately provide irrigation water for about 1,200,000 acres of new land; and the Boulder Dam development will probably supply water to more than 1,000,000 acres in California and Arizona. But these works are still far from completion. The Commissioner of Reclamation has estimated that not more than 150,000 acres of new land can be made available for settlement in any 1 year during the next 10. This will mean resettlement opportunities for a maximum of about 2,000 families a year—and even this figure will not be reached for several years.

But there are other chances of expansion. In the more humid sections of the Pacific Northwest, lie thousands of acres of cut-over land which could be developed into productive farms. Many tracts in this region, of course, would prove unsuited to farming even if cleared, because of either location or poor soil or both. Yet development of even the best cut-over land has been greatly retarded because of the high cost of clearing.

A Problem of Land and Finance

Until recently, the cost of preparing these logged-off lands for farming ran from \$200 to \$300 per acre. During the past few years, however several business concerns have experimented with applying heavy machinery to land clearing, and claim to have reduced clearing costs to a range of \$50 to \$75 per acre. A group of farmers financed by the Farm Security Administration in the purchase of power clearing equipment report clearing costs of from \$20 to \$60 per acre. If these figures prove valid, the door may be opened to extensive settlement. But in the cut-over areas, as in the new irrigation projects, it will be essential to conduct careful surveys to ascertain which lands can support the cost of development.

Availability of good land is only one end of the problem. Most of the recent migrants have scant capital, if any, and need to be financed for construction of buildings, land development, livestock, equipment, operating capital, and even for livelihood during the first year or two.

The Bureau of Reclamation's requirement of \$2,000 in capital assets for each prospective settler would be prohibitive for nearly all migrants. Most of them, moreover, being inexperienced in irrigation farming or in the production of specialty crops, would require a good deal of training and supervision to have a fair chance of success. Another problem is that of guiding such settlement so that it will not aggravate the problem of existing crop surpluses.

Homes and Cooperative Farms

There is another type of settlement which might be tried: to enable the migrants to acquire small garden plots with low-rental housing near sources of employment. This would not only permit the settlers to grow a part of their food, live in decent homes, and enjoy some of the advantages of a settled mode of life, but it would provide as well a base from which the father and elder sons could migrate in search of jobs within a radius of 25 to 100 miles. In fact, the Farm Security Administration has established 20 garden homes of this type at Arvin, California, each home placed on two-thirds of an acre and renting for \$8.20 a month; and they have allocated funds to build 150 additional units.

Still another approach is the organization of large cooperative farms, such as that at Casa Grande, Ariz., which the Farm Security Administration set up for 60 farm laborers' families. In such a venture it is hoped to secure the advantages of large-scale operation for small farmers working cooperatively under expert direction. If this enterprise accomplishes what is expected of it there are many opportunities for similar projects in California and Arizona. Big blocks of good land are available where large-scale farming is being carried on at present with hired managers and thousands of landless laborers.

We have, then, outlined several approaches to the absorption of these homeless thousands. No one of them is likely to clear up the migrant problem by itself. But it must be emphasized that this problem has grown beyond the reach of separate States to tackle, that Federal action is imperative, and that this action will have to assume the double task of both relief and cure, of present amelioration and permanent rehabilitation.

First Checks

LESS than 6 months from the date their options were accepted in Washington, checks were delivered in June to the first landowners to be paid for tracts acquired under the Bankhead-Jones Act's Title III program.

The tract bought from Mr. Barney H. Connor, of Randall County, Texas, includes the site of the dam on the Tierra Blanca land utiliza-

tion project of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The other tract was bought from Dr. and Mrs. Isaac Rasco. The two together amount to a little less than 2,500 acres, and both are included in the Umbarger project.

The Tierra Blanca project, on which an 1,850-acre lake is being impounded, is one of the B. A. E.'s first water conservation projects. In addition to its water conservation feature, the project will make recreation facilities available to 83,000 people living in an eight-county district now without such play areas.

A New Lease for a New South

by JOHN BAKER

U nless the program to adjust land use in the upland Cotton Belt¹ can remove one formidable stumbling block, all its charts, tables, and statistics will not suffice to change seriously the fundamental agricultural pattern of this region. And that stumbling block is all the more difficult to push aside, since it is elusive, intangible, a compound of prejudice and inertia. It is, to be brief, the traditional "third and fourth" lease of the cotton South: the custom of setting the tenant's rent at one-fourth of the cotton he grows, and one-third of his other crops.

The significance of this system is apparent. The land-use program for these regions calls for a shift from cash cropping to a more diversified farming, emphasizing livestock production and the use of the land for pasture rather than cultivation. Yet under the "third and fourth" contract, every encouragement is given to the maintenance of the *status quo*. Landlords dissuade tenants from acquiring livestock, and prove exceedingly reluctant to rent lands to tenants with large herds, or to those who wish to raise them. Why shouldn't they? For under the prevailing leasing arrangements the landlord receives only a share of the crops in payment for the annual use of his farm; time spent in caring for livestock is time lost on the production of cotton and corn, from which the landlord derives an income.

¹ This Belt does not form a contiguous province, but numerous scattered areas embracing the foothills of the Southern Appalachians, the rolling lands of the upper Coastal Plains, the hill and valley topography of tributary streams, and the lower ridges of the Ozark-Ouachita Range. It includes parts of 10 States: North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, and Oklahoma.

Leases and Regional Mores

The inhibition of land-use adjustment which this system constitutes is further revealed when one notes that over half the farm operators in the upland Cotton Belt are tenants, and that *about two-thirds of these tenants are third-and-fourth renters*. Moreover, by far the most prevalent form of these arrangements is a 1-year unwritten agreement, under which the tenant has no assurance whatever that he can remain on the same farm longer than that year, or perhaps for less—while on the other hand the development of a livestock farm organization is a long-range undertaking demanding a long-range and stable tenure.

If these uneconomic leases were being retained simply because of the self-interest of landlords, it would be bad enough. But what is worse, the tenants themselves have come to accept the system almost as a natural law. I have talked with tenants who told me that they would not rent from landlords so dishonest as not to use a third-and-fourth contract. Not so many years ago, a popular political movement in Texas was fostered and nourished by its emphasis upon the tradition of the third-and-fourth lease for tenants and the half-and-half lease for croppers. Although the statute making illegal the collection of more than one-fourth the cotton and one-third of the other crops was subsequently declared unconstitutional, the belief that the third-and-fourth lease and its companion, the half-and-half lease, are the only "right" contracts between a landlord and a share tenant has not diminished. This worship is a result of both habit and social inertia and lack of knowledge of other methods of renting.

Away From Cash Crops

Land utilization authorities seem to agree that a shift from cash-crop production to a system of farming embracing livestock and forestry is the proper adjustment for the vast region made up of the various local areas in the upland Cotton Belt.

They recommend this shift for two reasons: (1) conservation of the land resources, and (2) maintenance of satisfactory standards of living for the residents of the region. The softness of the rocks—shales, limestones, and sandstones—together with the deficiency in organic matter of forest soils, make the soil particularly susceptible to erosion. Soil leaching and soil erosion occur almost all year long as a consequence of the abundant rainfall and the open ground during all or most of the winter. Both cotton and corn, which are intertilled crops, leave a large portion of the ground surface unprotected from the washing of rains both in summer and in winter.

Not only does the continued cotton and corn production tear away the physical structure of the land, but the region is placed at an increasing disadvantage in competition with high cotton yields of the fertile valleys and deltas and with the low cost cotton production of western

Texas. Small irregular fields unsuited to improved machinery, decreasing cotton yields, and high fertilizer costs are said to be making it more and more difficult for the upland cotton producer to maintain a reasonable standard of living for his family.

Owners More Progressive Than Renters

Owner-operators of farms in these areas appear to concur in the recommendations of the land utilization experts. In general, throughout the upland Cotton Belt, owner-operators are now placing more of their land into pasture, keeping more cattle, raising more pigs, selling more cream and more milk for cheese than formerly. Vegetable gardens are becoming a greater part of the farm enterprise on owner-operated units.

But these facts can lead us easily to overoptimism. It remains unfortunately true that share renters in the Upland Cotton Belt are not making these shifts in farm organization as are owner farmers and they will not make them unless the system by which they rent is adjusted at the same time.

If this statement of the problem is correct, it indicates three lines of approach:

1. A program of education involving the introduction, adoption, and use of improved leases which will provide for a sharing of livestock proceeds as well as crop products.
2. A revision of State laws regulating landlord and tenant relations so as to increase the security of tenure of tenant farmers.
3. A strong and continuing program aimed at increasing the ownership of farms by their operators.

Here and there throughout the Upland Cotton Belt landlords themselves are making attempts to set up a share renting system based upon livestock production as well as crop production. These efforts should be encouraged, and improved leasing procedures should be made available to these people. Vocational agriculture instructors and county agricultural agents have here both a responsibility and a fertile field of endeavor.

The Technique of Change

No single lease form can be developed which will apply satisfactorily to all conditions of farming in the Upland Cotton Belt, nor to all farms within even a small localized area. Complex variations from farm to farm and from area to area point to the need for adequately supported research to formulate leases suited to particular farms in particular regions.

Even continued and invigorated research, however, will prove of little value if landlords and tenants are not informed of improved methods of farm leasing. Nor will an educational program in these areas

be easy to carry out. It must aim at changing attitudes and traditions, as well as at giving needed information. The third-and-fourth custom possesses all the inertia that nearly a century of continued habit can give. The mere spreading of information will not be enough to undermine it.

The burden of carrying forward this education program falls most logically at present upon such State agencies as the agricultural extension service and the vocational agriculture teachers, but should not be limited to them. Agricultural credit agencies, particularly those extending production credit to tenant farmers in these areas, should aid in the process.

Techniques to be followed in teaching improved leasing methods to high school students in vocational agriculture should be developed through the cooperation of tenure research groups with State and Federal organizations supervising vocational agricultural education. Appropriate procedures should also be devised for the instruction of part-time, youth-out-of-school, and adult groups, and other Southern States could well follow Oklahoma's example in adding a farm tenancy specialist to the staff of the agricultural extension service.

The Place and Function of Education

Admittedly, an educational program alone cannot bring about all of the improvement needed in the leasing system of these areas. It must, in fact, function as an integral part of a larger and national program to make farm tenure more secure—for only security can enable tenants to adopt long-range plans and policies for the use of their land. We have cited two directions which such a program will take—a renovation of State laws regulating the landlord-tenant relationship, and a progressive increase in farm ownership by operators. Obviously, achievements along either or both of these lines will render easier the task of bettering present leasing arrangements.

But these considerations must not be taken to obviate the primary importance of extensive and thorough reeducation of tenants and landlords alike throughout the regions where the third-and-fourth and the half-and-half systems hold sway. Ignorance, misinformation, and resistance to change are the fundamental barriers to good land use here. Only by attacking these at their source, by explanation and by example, will we clear away these obstructions and release the farmers of the Upland Cotton Belt from dependence upon an outmoded leasing system harnessed to an outmoded cash-crop system.

The Farmer Turns Forester—A Study in Cooperation

by WILLIAM S. SWINGLER

Designated by tradition as the historic home of individualism, New England is now giving the rest of the country a significant lesson in cooperation. Up in Vermont and New Hampshire, farmers have banded together to market their timber collectively, stabilizing their market, their prices, and their operations. Mr. Swingler, who as a member of the United States Forest Service and the first trustee of the cooperative has been in the thick of this venture, looks back over its evolution and its achievements.

Cooperative buying and selling by farm organizations is a relatively old idea in all parts of the United States. However, when an organization is formed to specialize in selling products from farm woodlands, the idea properly comes under the heading of news.

An association of this nature, known as the Forest Products Association, Inc., now exists in northern New Hampshire. Headquarters have been established in Groveton, N. H., and the majority of the membership has been drawn from Coos County, N. H., and Essex County, Vt.

The association's aims are to assist the farm woodland owner in placing his land under sustained yield management, thus increasing his annual yield of forest products, and to stabilize the prices received for those products. When a small woodland owner attempts to institute better cutting practices on his land, he is at once confronted by two problems. The first is that he will be able to harvest only a relatively small amount of products at any one time, and the second, that during the first cut much of his material will be of inferior quality. Both of these factors increase the difficulty of selling and in many cases act as effective bars to better forestry practices. The association is in a position to eliminate both of these objectionable features. By collecting small amounts of products from each of a large number of members, the association is able to obtain a better and more stable market because of the large amounts of products involved. The landowners also receive the additional advantage of obtaining a fair price for their products, irrespective of their individual trading ability.

Native to New England Soil

The association grew naturally and logically from the condition of farm-forestry in northern New Hampshire and Vermont. Coos and



A farmer-member signs up for the Forest Products Association.
(F. S. A. photo)

Essex Counties are both heavily wooded, containing approximately 1,225,000 acres of forest land. Much of this is in large industrial ownerships, but, according to the latest available figures, farmers and small owners control over 250,000 acres of forest land. This timber is of either a spruce-fir type or of northern hardwood and, together with milk products, forms the principal source of income for the average farm.

Cooperative selling of forest products first got under way in 1929 when the Coos County farm agent and the New Hampshire Extension Service organized a small cooperative for the purpose of selling Christmas trees. From 1929 to 1935 this cooperative shipped 35 carloads of trees to the larger cities on the eastern seaboard. The existence of two large paper mills in the area also increased the chances of success for a cooperative. Under ordinary conditions these two mills furnished a ready market for all pulpwood cut in the area. Because of these favorable conditions, the New Hampshire Extension Service had been thinking in terms of a cooperative for a number of years.

Yet it was the collapse of the boom in 1929 which gave the decisive impetus to the formation of the cooperative. In common with the rest of the country, these sections of Vermont and New Hampshire were hard hit by the depression. The market for milk and pulpwood practically ceased to exist, and neither the paper mills nor the local banks were in a position to finance the average woods operations. The extension service realized the importance of forming a cooperative immediately if it was to be of material benefit to the landowners.

The Beginning—Relief Agencies Lend a Hand

First to be approached, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration granted an allotment of \$100,000 to the New Hampshire Rural Rehabilitation Corporation to finance a cooperative.

The subsequent experience of the association under the New Hampshire Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, and then under the Resettlement Administration, was of great value to both the officers and the rank and file of the cooperative. But the lessons it learned were painful and expensive. It started under the handicap of a regulation that wood producers receiving loans must be either on relief or in desperate financial straits; and since most of the farmers in this individualist region were neither on the relief rolls nor anxious to prove their poverty, the cooperative had hard sledding until in September of 1935, 182 woodland owners petitioned the Government to strike out this prerequisite, and in November set up the Forest Products Association as a more closely knit organization.

At one point the Association nearly foundered as a result of an exacting credit arrangement which assessed the wood producer a 10-percent commission on the total value of his sales through the Association, as well as interest charges on his production loan. Since in effect this penalized the producer for his cooperation, a scant 40 owners financed their operations through the Association during this first year.

This procedure was changed when the Secretary of Agriculture transferred supervision of the \$100,000 Government loan to the United States Forest Service. By May 21, 1937, the transfer had been consummated, new trust and loan agreements had been signed, and a trustee responsible to the Forest Service appointed. It was decided forthwith to liberalize the terms of these agreements in an attempt to make the Association a greater benefit to its members and the community.

The Straight Line Between Lender and Borrower

The method of loaning money to the producer was also simplified. The marketing agreement, the use of which had complicated the financial transactions, was discontinued, and all pertinent items included in the sales contract. An initial loan of \$200, secured by promissory notes alone, is made to each producer. This will permit him to start operation; in many cases it is the only advance required. If he desires additional funds, the policy becomes the same as in force the previous year.

The collecting of commissions was also dropped. Instead, the mills were asked to pay a higher price when buying from the Association. This the mills could afford, since dealing with the Association eliminated any commissions to buyers. The Association realized additional operating funds by buying wood outright and selling it at a profit, under the terms of the contract offered to each member. The pro-

ducer had two choices: he could contract to sell his wood at the present market price or at the market price on delivery.

Immediately after the reorganization, the United States Forest Service and the extension services of New Hampshire and Vermont united in a drive to acquaint the woodland owners with the simplified procedure. During the drive 243 woodland owners were interviewed. In addition to selling the idea of a cooperative, the interviewers estimated the amount of available pulpwood on each ownership and determined the owner's reaction to improved cutting practices. The manager of the Forest Products Association also held a number of meetings throughout the area, explaining the workings of the Association.

Results and a Look to the Future

The results outran expectations. Membership jumped tenfold. During the year ending May 21, 1938, the Association contracted to sell approximately 27,000 cords of pulpwood to the local mills. This wood was produced by 300 members, and another 100 members produced 23 carloads of Christmas trees which were collected and shipped to the large centers in eastern United States. In fact, 90 percent of the pulpwood produced from farm woodlands in Coos and Essex Counties was sold through the cooperative.

In spite of this large increase in membership and volume of business, it has become apparent that the cooperative should be founded on a basis more substantial than the selling of only one product—in this case, pulpwood. Past experience shows that during some years practically no pulpwood is purchased. To guard against such a contingency, the Association is now planning to expand the scope of its business. This expansion will include dealing in hardwood logs, cedar poles and posts, and planed lumber.

As noted before, one of the prime purposes for forming a cooperative was to improve cutting and forestry practices on the lands of the members. Although the principal effort to date has been expended in putting the Association on a paying basis, the important work of instituting better forestry practices has not been forgotten. From the very beginning the sales contract has contained a clause in which the producer agreed to cut his land in accordance with the recommendations of the State extension services and to handle his woodland under principles of maximum sustained yield. Realizing that many of the members had little idea concerning proper cutting practices, and that a considerable amount of education would be required if this clause were to mean anything, the United States Forest Service and the New Hampshire Extension Service during the early spring of 1937 cooperated in establishing 60 demonstration plots. On each of these plots the trees to be removed were marked; the producer was then to cut the remainder of his land along the same pattern.

Pioneering for Stable Prices and Better Practices

Further, both the trustee representing the Forest Service and the State extension foresters have spent considerable time in the field, talking with the Association's producers, looking over their woodlots, and discussing cutting practices with them. On a more ambitious scale, a wide survey has been undertaken by the Forest Service with the assistance of nearby C. C. C. camps, cruising over some 250,000 acres, of which 190,000 have now been examined, the rest of the work to be completed by the spring of 1939.

It is to be expected that any new venture of this sort will encounter failures along with its successes; and in this connection the Forest Products Association, Inc., has been no exception. However, after 2 years' existence one is able to note progress toward the ultimate goal—that of stabilizing prices and improving forestry practices. Moreover, the experience gained will prove of inestimable value to the other forest products cooperatives now being established.

Nonresident Ownership— Evil or Scapegoat?

by MORRIS EVANS

The scapegoat is a convenient creature of the imagination on which to pour resentment in troubled times. Mr. Evans, who is in charge of land economics for the B. A. E. in the Southern Great Plains, suggests that the nonresident owner has perhaps unrightfully been assigned this role. Even those who disagree with the author's thesis will find the facts in his article revealing.

—EDITOR.

In any program for the rehabilitation of agriculture in the Southern Great Plains, one of the most puzzling problems encountered is that of nonresident ownership of land. Nor will it be possible to draw up and carry through a stable and satisfactory land program until some kind of solution is found for the difficulties this tenure presents. Yet about no other phase of land use in this region does more confusion exist: the

degree of dogmatic certainty as to the effects of nonresident ownership seems in inverse proportion to the amount of data available. Both land-use planners and local farmers have for years blandly assumed that this kind of tenure produced certain general results markedly different from those associated with owner operation—and the comparison has been traditionally unfavorable to the nonresidents.

It was to determine whether or not these widely held ideas had any reasonable grounds for the belief that so many people placed in them that the study now offered was undertaken, to determine as precisely as possible what were the actual facts of this situation.

First, what is the present pattern of ownership in this region? In some counties as much as 70 percent of the area is nonresident¹ owned; but elsewhere in the Southern Great Plains this type of ownership drops to less than 20 percent. An analysis of land ownership in 50 counties in the region—centering around the area where the 5 States come closest together—shows that only 38 percent of the 48,000,000 acres is owned by nonresident individuals. Southwest Kansas has the highest percent of acreage in this ownership, followed in order by the Texas Panhandle, Oklahoma Panhandle, southeast Colorado, and northeast New Mexico. Corporations and other organizations are essentially nonresident owners. As a group they own a large acreage in the 50 counties, but their holdings are concentrated in a few counties and amount to only 8.6 percent of the total.

Do They Plant More Wheat?

Now, among the charges which are laid against the nonresident owners is the one that they are responsible for the greater share of land planted to wheat each year. This belief is based largely on the activities of "suitcase" farmers and other nonresident operators. It is true that in some counties most of the nonresident-owned land is plowed out; in these same counties most of the resident-owned land is also plowed out.

An analysis of land use of nonresident- and resident-owned land (omitting Government land) in six counties fails to prove that the nonresidents are worse than the residents as to proportion of land plowed out. In Greeley County, Kansas, plowed land was 58 percent of the total for both types of owner. In Gray County, Kansas, nonresident land was 81 percent plowed out and resident land 76 percent. In Texas County, Oklahoma, 61 percent of the nonresident land was plowed out and 65 percent of the resident owned. In Prowers County,

¹ The term "nonresident" as used herein refers to individuals who live outside the county in which the land is located, to corporations whose headquarters are outside the county, or to other types of owners whose residence is outside the county in which the land is located.

Colorado, the percentages were 20 and 27, respectively; in Curry County, New Mexico, 61 and 64 percent; and in Sherman County, Texas, 55 and 54 percent. In all counties except Curry there was more land owned by nonresident than by resident.

Is the Non-resident Careless of His Land?

There appear to be some grounds for the complaint that the non-resident owner is more careless of his land than is the resident owner. Data on this point are as yet insufficient for a general statement, but in some areas it is possible to establish a definite relationship between residence of the operator and condition of the land. On 275 farms in Haskell and Seward Counties, Kansas, erosion conditions indicate that the nonresident operator was more careless of his land than the resident operator—whether owner or tenant.

But other figures hardly bear out this generality. In 1936 the soils unit of the Resettlement Administration made an erosion survey of farms covered by a farm-management survey. Wind erosion had occurred to some extent on all the land so the tabulations were made for areas from which 25 percent of the top soil had been removed or for



Rains are falling on both resident and nonresident lands—but from which do these dust storms more often rise? (F. S. A. photo)

areas of accumulation showing hummocks of 6 inches or more. Fifty-six percent of the nonresident-owned land showed these degrees of erosion compared with 53 percent for resident owner operators. Erosion on land owned by nonresident part owners was 47 percent of the area, compared with 37 percent for the resident part owners. On rented land of the nonresident part owner eroded land was 58 percent of the area, compared with 52 percent for the resident part owner. These data give support to the claim that nonresident owners do not care for their land—but they indict the resident owner almost as severely.

The Pot and the Kettle . . .

Much of the complaint against the nonresident owner must be ascribed to the resident's desire to shift onto someone else the blame for the soil erosion he himself has been unable or too negligent to check. Certainly the nonresident deserves censure; but to put all the onus on him does not contribute to a realistic understanding of the situation. In this case also, the pot is quite as black as the kettle.

Nor can the degree of land abandonment be charged against non-residents as an unmitigated social loss. Abandonment is bad for the land where erosion is not stopped, but it may be an excellent thing where weeds and other vegetation have come in and protected the earth from erosion. Left to herself, Nature will revegetate all except the most severely damaged lands. While attempts to help Nature in the work of revegetation are beneficial if wisely done and properly timed, ventures ill-advised or sloppily carried out may aggravate the previous deterioration.

Some residents, on the other hand, are blessed with a short memory of their announced good intentions. One of the most frequent comments heard during the period of severe dust storms is, "If I can only get a cover on that field, even weeds, I won't touch it again until there's no more danger of blowing." Then summer and fall showers come—and the cover is torn up and a crop scratched in, to blow away next season.

Abandonments and Improvements

It is true, however, that analyses of abandoned land on purchase projects reveal a higher percentage for nonresident than resident owners. In the purchase area of Cimarron County, Oklahoma, nonresident individuals own 61 percent of the "open" (or abandoned) pasture and 63 percent of the abandoned cropland. In Baca County, Colorado, the percentages are 52 and 63; in Las Animas County, Colorado, 50 and 52 percent; and in Morton County, Kansas, 40 and 49 percent, respectively. In Union County, New Mexico, where nonresidents own but 23 percent of the county, they own 51 percent of the "open" pasture and 29 percent of the abandoned cropland on the purchase project.

The claim that the improvements on nonresident-owned land are worse than on owned land can be substantiated only in part. Data as to this point are not yet available for the 50 counties and comparison must be made on the basis of tenure of operator. Most tenant-operated land belongs to owners who live outside the county or at least not on their own farms.

Many residents believe, too, that abandonment of houses is higher on nonresident- than on resident-owned land. But the available data are insufficient to prove or disprove this allegation. In Prowers County, Colorado, where nonresidents own 80 percent more land than residents there are 60 percent more abandoned houses on nonresident land. In Gray County, Kansas, nonresidents own 20 percent more land and have 56 percent more abandoned houses. In Curry County, New Mexico, however, nonresidents own less than half as much land and have less than one-fourth as many abandoned houses. There is the same ratio of abandoned houses on nonresident-owned as on resident-owned land in Texas County, Oklahoma; but in Sherman County, Texas, the ratio is higher on the resident-owned land.

Who Pays the Taxes?

Again, nonresident owners are severely criticized for not paying their taxes. A frequent comment is that nonresidents spend all the income from their land at their place of residence and do not contribute anything to the support of the community in which their land is located. Yet a study of county records bears this out only in part.

A study of technical tax delinquency in Baca County, Colorado, for the 1935 levy shows 61 percent of the resident-owned and 52 percent of the nonresident-owned land as delinquent. Later a large part of these taxes were paid but the relative condition of residents and nonresidents remained about the same. Considered by farming areas, the resident technical delinquency varied from 56 to 68 percent and the nonresident delinquency varied from 28 to 61 percent. Delinquency, seemingly, was not closely related to soils or to type of farming except that regardless of ownership the highest delinquency occurred in one rough, broken pasture area.

In Stevens County, Kansas, analysis of tax delinquency 3 months after due date shows that, at least during drought years, the resident did not keep up his end so well as the nonresident. For the years 1934, 1935, and 1936 the percent of resident-owned land that was tax delinquent amounted to 13.3, 22.9, and 32.4, and for the nonresident-owned land 10.6, 11.7, and 21.4. Figures for Dallam County, Texas, show a higher percentage of tax-delinquent land in the hands of residents in 1931 to 1935, although nonresidents probably owned a larger portion of the total county area judging by the survey made in 1936.

The Farmer's Comment

Yet the feeling persists throughout this region that nonresident ownership is at the root of the agricultural malaise. In 1936 the Land Use Planning Division of the Resettlement Administration of the Southern Great Plains Region made a land-use survey of all farm operators in 50 counties. The field men were instructed to include in their notes any comments that the farm operator cared to make concerning any phase of agriculture. And the most frequent comment was a condemnation of nonresident operation of cropland. Nonresident owners, as a class, were also taken harshly to task. In fact, a large part of the farmers interviewed stated unequivocally that resident control of nonresident-owned land is necessary if agricultural adjustment is to be effected.

In some county planning meetings too, it was suggested that the Federal Government acquire title to or otherwise get control of large areas of nonresident-owned land that are or have been a menace to surrounding lands. Similar recommendations were made by State representatives at the meeting held in Dalhart, Texas, on November 18, 1936, at which time representatives of the President's Drought Committee were securing first-hand information for their report to the President. The Regional Advisory Committee on Land Use Practices for the Southern Great Plains has repeatedly called attention to the problems caused by or associated with nonresident ownership and nonresident operation of lands.

The foregoing discussion is not an attempt either to indict or defend the nonresident individual type of ownership. To a casual observer the criticisms of this type of ownership can be readily justified. To the more than casual observer there is frequently little to choose between resident and nonresident ownership.

Contributors to This Issue

DAVIS MCENTIRE is an agricultural economist in the B. A. E.'s Division of Land Economics. . . . HYMAN BRONFIN is statistical assistant to the Assistant Chief in charge of Land Utilization, B. A. E. . . . W. S. SWINGLER is associate conservationist of the United States Forest Service. . . . MORRIS EVANS is in charge of land economics for the B. A. E.'s Southern Great Plains land utilization region. . . . J. B. KOHLMAYER is State land planning specialist for Indiana in the B. A. E.'s program. . . . JOHN BAKER is assistant agricultural economist in the Land Economics Division of B. A. E.

Title III Purchase Program—1938

The first year of the land-utilization program under Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Act has just drawn to a close, but many persons, in and out of the program, still lack a precise statement of how much land is being acquired by the Bureau, and where, and how much is being paid for it. For these people, we present the following table, prepared by Hyman Bronfin, statistician for the land-utilization program . . .

Region and number of projects authorized by Secretary	Authorizations for land purchase		Lands previously acquired
	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Cost</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Northern Plains (20).....	1,316,452	\$4,244,266	3,368,346
Southern Great Plains (12) ¹ ..	702,354	2,064,324	121,963
Region I (12).....	30,392	336,407	191,721
Region II (9).....	15,654	154,595	351,128
Region III (7).....	14,964	382,784	113,732
Region IV (13).....	23,328	218,350	278,498
Region V (12).....	33,857	387,883	937,638
Region VI (10).....	25,130	173,751	296,400
Region VIII (3).....	7,705	46,532	56,328
Region IX (2).....	8,640	18,335	65,358
Region XI (4).....	14,266	84,313	546,444
Total (104) ²	2,192,742	\$8,111,540	6,327,556

¹ Union County, LU-NM-38-21, Cimarron County, LU-OK-38-21, and Dallam County, LU-TX-38-23 are counted as one project.

² While all projects outside the Great Plains are coterminous with projects established under the Farm Security Administration or antecedent agencies, except for one small Arkansas project, 20 of the 32 projects authorized for the Great Plains are entirely new.

★ August 15 is the date when earth will begin to fly on projects now being set up for the Department's flood-control and water-facilities programs. B. A. E. has been given the planning responsibility for water facilities, while S. C. S. will follow with development. Plans for flood control projects are still being produced by watershed committees representative of various departmental bureaus.

Land Use and Local Government

Indiana Counties Find a Way to Greater Efficiency

by J. B. KOHLMAYER

More economical administration of local government, an increase in public forests and recreational lands, and a more thorough understanding of the problems of land-use adjustment and their relationship to local governmental problems are among the concrete returns that the land utilization program is bringing to the counties of southern Indiana. Through the cooperative action of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics with State and local agencies, a two-fold program is developing for the sound economic utilization of land throughout a problem area covering some 1,500,000 acres.

Indiana's major land-use problem area includes approximately 50 percent of the land of 20 southern counties, or about 6.5 percent of the whole State. Throughout the area, consisting mostly of hilly land, poor soils which lie intermingled with the good bottom or valley lands, have been farmed for generations. Since 1880, the infertility of these tracts has driven one generation of farmers after another off the land, but because the area lay close to heavily populated regions, and because the character of the land was not well known, other settlers have flocked in to take their place. As a result of this chronic exploitation of timber and soil resources, much of this land has already been abandoned, but there are still some 7,000 families in the area attempting to make a living on land unsuited to agricultural use. A large percentage of these families are dependent entirely, or in part, upon relief or old-age pensions. Because of the scattered population, per capita school costs are disproportionately high; and because of the lack of taxable wealth, governmental services are provided almost entirely by the more productive land in the same township or county and by State aids. Tax delinquency is rife, and land is held in a transient type of ownership.

Brown and Martin County Projects

Recognizing the need for a concrete attack on this problem, the Federal Government (through the former Land Policy Section of the A. A. A.) cooperated with local people, the State Conservation Commission, and with Purdue University in planning two projects designed to demonstrate how these problems could be solved by public acquisition of this land.

The initial response to the program was much more favorable than anticipated. In fact, because of the demands of local people, about five times as many acres have been purchased as was originally planned.

In Brown County, a 20,000-acre area has been acquired and developed as forest land, both for timber production and recreational uses. In Martin County, where 30,000 acres have been purchased, more intensive recreational facilities have been introduced; notably an 800-acre lake created by construction of a large earth-filled dam, and picnic shelters, parking grounds, trails, and a park road built to accommodate visitors from the many rural and urban communities, within easy driving distance. On the remainder of the area, reforestation, timber stand improvement, fire protection, and wildlife management have helped to put the land in shape for future economic value as a forest. Work on both areas has been carried out with relief labor, provided through the Works Progress Administration.

Development of these two submarginal farmland projects has been planned in close cooperation with the Indiana State Conservation Commission, which will take over the areas for administration and management in the future, since they fit easily into the extensive program of State forests and parks which that agency has developed. Only a very few of the families from these areas have needed help in relocating elsewhere; with the money received from the sale of their land they have been able to find other homes, either on better farms or in nonagricultural occupations.

Land Classification Clarifies the Problem

To assist the establishment of the two submarginal land projects, detailed land classification was started in Martin County. Although the lead in this work was taken by the State land use planning office, now attached to the B. A. E., the final mapping of land classes was carried out through groups of county farmers and officials who were acquainted with local conditions at first hand.

Reduction of the land classification material to colored maps, showing the relationship of land classes to roads, schools, tax data, and other local problems, enlightened local leaders on their economic situation. When one prominent citizen saw that about half of Martin County's rural population was located on land classed as unsuited to farming, and that this land was concentrated in certain portions of the county, he declared, "I've been working on the tax problem of Martin County for the past 25 years, but I never realized until now that our tax problem in this county will never be solved until we solve our submarginal land problem."

Land classification maps have now been prepared by groups of local farmers composed of township A. A. A. field men and the county

agricultural planning committees of 20 counties in the southern Indiana problem area. In many of these counties the way is now being prepared for a more economical local governmental administration, and for the sounder planning of public improvements in the light of economic facts concerning the land.

Reduction in Governmental Costs

Although the purchase of 30,000 acres of land in Martin County has reduced the township and county tax base, and the amount of tax income, the costs of government have been reduced at an even more rapid rate. For every reduction of \$1 in property tax incomes, local governmental expenses will be reduced \$10. This economy is effected through the abandonment of roads, elimination of high per capita cost schools, and reduction in relief and old-age pension costs. Even further economies will be effected by township consolidation.

The consolidation of townships is already an accomplished fact. In April 1938, the board of commissioners of Martin County, upon petition of township freeholders, took the necessary action to make effective the elimination of two townships, which were consolidated with three adjoining townships. As a result, township expenditures will be reduced about \$2,400 annually. In Baker township, one of the two consolidated, the total rate will be decreased from 40 to 35 mills. The township tax rate will be reduced from 14 to 9 mills.

Guiding Public Programs

The constructive value of land classification is also shown by the way in which it is being used as a guide for the various public programs carried out in southern Indiana counties. As a result, county auditors are beginning to see the futility of investing school fund mortgage money on farms in the submarginal areas, and more than one county has adopted a strict policy of refusing to grant loans for farms in these areas. This information and point of view is also being brought to the attention of other lending agencies, both public and private.

Formerly, these counties used to spend a great deal of their road money in the poorer areas "because the people needed the work." Now the counties understand that such a policy merely prolongs the period of land-use maladjustment and its undermining effect upon local fiscal conditions. Certain counties are now planning to invest their road money only in the good farm areas, knowing that such investment brings added values, while money spent in the submarginal areas produces little or nothing. Programs of rural electrification and other public improvements are following a like course. The effect of land classification in this respect might be termed a "practical rural zoning."

What the Local People Think

An essential factor in this movement for better land utilization in southern Indiana has been that the facts are recognized and understood by responsible local people. In a majority of these 20 counties, there is an urgent demand on the part of the farmers that land acquisition be continued and extended so that they, too, may have an opportunity to improve their social and economic positions by selling their tracts and relocating where opportunities for success are more favorable. Those on fertile, well-located land know that their taxes will be reduced as a result of this program, and that in the years to come the forests will again contribute to the wealth of the community. Before large-scale achievements can be won, more funds for land acquisition must be provided and more educational work must be carried out; but the positive steps already taken reveal convincingly the value of the demonstration projects and the land-classification work in this important corn-belt area.



Here and there

★ Cooperation and coordination were much in evidence the last few weeks. . . . Note the recently concluded conferences of B.A.E. and Farm Credit Administration officials, regional and of the Washington variety. . . . They agreed (1) to an arrangement whereby the Federal land banks will execute deeds when asked to do so by B. A. E. and hold them in escrow until payment is made for the land in question, thereby reconciling B. A. E. policy of delivery of deeds during course of title clearance and F. C. A. policy that does not permit this . . . (2) that the land banks are not required to execute mortgage satisfactions until payment is received . . . (3) to submit to the Solicitor's Office a draft of a proposed special warrant deed, since they cannot execute general warranty deeds . . . (4) that the land banks will have all income from land accruing before date of payment, and will control use of the land save for limited rights under option terms . . . (5) that the land banks will write option and "consent to option" forms without inserting time-limit clauses . . . (6) that the land banks will waive the requirement of cash deposit when abstracts are loaned, so far as the Title III program is concerned. . . . All of which, Mr. James M. Gray, in charge of land acquisition, believes, adds up to "future benefits to both the Farm Credit Administration and this Bureau (B. A. E.)."

★ "Chronic poverty and cultural stagnation for millions of people" because of an unbalanced distribution of population is predicted by the National Resources Committee in a report to President Roosevelt. Farming, mining, and forest areas hold some of the most critical overpopulation problems, the committee found. In the Southeast, which the President has characterized as "Problem No. 1" of the economy, the net annual value of agricultural products per worker in the 1924-28 period was \$672, or less than one-third of the value of the products produced per man in the Northeast and about half the national average. The most direct and apparent solution for these areas, decided the committee, is migration. . . .

★ Reports on tax problems of 44 Idaho counties, each principal region within the State, and the State as a whole, are nearing final form. The study, undertaken by the Idaho Planning Board, devotes special attention to present and prospective land use problems, and their bearing on public finance . . .

★ J. Franklin Bonner is the newly elected temporary president and Thomas W. Mackesey is the secretary of the recently organized New York State Federation of Official Planning Boards, which is designed as a medium for exchange of ideas and experience in planning and zoning. Mr. Bonner is director of the Monroe County division of regional planning and Mr. Mackesey is with the New York State Division of State Planning . . .

★ Duke University this fall will establish, after 7 years of preparation, the third American graduate school in forestry . . . A 4,938-acre forest adjoins the Duke campus, a 300-acre arboretum is being developed and 54 species of trees have already been planted . . . Dr. Clarence F. Korstian is dean of the new school. He will be assisted by seven trained staff members the first year . . .

★ Continuance of land utilization agencies in the Department of Agriculture and addition to that Department of new agencies "concerned with renewable resources" was advocated by the American Association for the Advancement of Science at its last meeting in Indianapolis. It had taken the same position previously, in 1934.

★ About 1,160,000 persons moved from farms to urban communities last year, but 872,000 moved from cities, towns, and villages to farms, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has reported. Farm population gained for the year, however, because births offset both the losses from migration and from other causes. . . .



Books

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF RURAL ZONING. *Ralph B. Wertheimer. California Law Review. XXVI (2) 175-205. January 1938*

The constitutionality of rural zoning was discussed in a general and nontechnical fashion in an article by Dr. C. I. Hendrickson in the August 1936 issue of the *Journal of Farm Economics*, and at some length in the mimeographed *Land Use Planning Publication No. 11*.¹ But Mr. Wertheimer's article is the first which has given the subject a detailed treatment in print.

An interesting feature of Mr. Wertheimer's treatment, in view of its appearance in a legal periodical, is the atmosphere of economic realism which pervades it. Care is taken to marshal the legal precedents against the background of economic and social facts in which rural zoning finds its real justification. This procedure not only ties the law down to reality, but helps the uninitiated reader to grasp the import of the legal analysis, and in addition publicizes the need for and the meaning of rural zoning to those outside the economics and planning fraternity.

Two main questions are dealt with: (1) whether Californian counties are empowered to adopt and enforce rural zoning regulations under existing Californian legislation; and (2) whether the process of rural zoning is a constitutional exercise of the police power. The first of these is disposed of within the space of a few pages; and the bulk of discussion is devoted to the second. An affirmative answer is given to each question; and, accordingly, whatever legal qualms Californian rural zoners may previously have had, they should now be able to go ahead with reasonable assurance. In thus helping to remove lurking doubts, the preparation and publication of this article has rendered a material service to the development of a rural zoning program.

The article's main edifice of juridical argument is built upon an analogy to urban and suburban zoning. The writer's thesis is that rural zoning is fundamentally not different in kind from the sort of zoning which is already firmly established in population centers. Since the

¹ *Some Considerations in Support of the Constitutionality of Rural Zoning as a Police Power Measure. Herman Walker, Jr., Land Use Planning Publication No. 11, December 1936. Land utilization division, Resettlement Administration, Washington, D. C.*

courts have accepted the one, they should accept the other, provided they can be shown persuasive justifications of legal validity and import. These the writer finds in the following: the social and financial evils attendant upon scattered and isolated settlement; conservation of the State's resources in land, water, wildlife, and recreational values; preservation and improvement of the tax base; promotion of health and safety; discouragement of fraud; and the general desirability of promoting rational land use. Supporting argument is sifted from a mass of court opinions. Both on particular counts and on the general proposition that the bounds of the police power have been permitted to expand to include a broad concept of the general welfare, the cases, when taken as a whole, point clearly to the reasonableness of rural zoning.

In the last few pages, a paragraph raises the question—as yet inadequately explored—of the possibility of extending zoning so as to regulate “higher uses” in districts set aside for “lower uses.” Concluding paragraphs briefly comment upon the problem of nonconforming uses and upon the necessity of measures to supplement zoning.—HERMAN WALKER, JR.

NORWEGIAN SETTLEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES. *Carlton C. Qualey. Norwegian-American Historical Association, Northfield, Minnesota. 1938*

This book relates the story of the settlement of the hundreds of thousands of Norwegian immigrants who came to the United States in the nineteenth century. It serves as a supplement to the admirable *History of Norwegian Migration to America, 1825-60*, by Theodore C. Blegen, which, like the present volume, is published by the Norwegian-American Historical Association as part of its series dealing with the Norwegian element in this country.

After reviewing the principal economic and social causes which produced discontent with the native land among the Norwegian people, the author traces the early migration to America, and then follows the immigrants as they move from one community to another in their search for permanent homes. Beginning with the first settlement of Norwegians in Orleans County, New York, in 1825, the Norwegian immigrants gradually dispersed through the early settlements in Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, the Dakotas, Nebraska, Michigan, and other areas.

The author is interested not only in the chronology of Norwegian settlement, but also in the attraction which America had for these people—the cheap or free land, plentiful employment, and the glowing terms in which these advantages were described in the American letters and in the publicity of emigration agents of the Western States and

railroads. Interesting extracts from some of the American letters which Professor Blegen collected in Norway, and detailed statistics of the Norwegians in the various communities are included. Professor Qualey's use of the census schedules has shown how valuable they may be for the history of the United States. No effort has been made to determine by what test these newcomers selected their land, whether they chose wisely or unwisely, or to evaluate their success in various communities. Prof. Joseph Schafer's detailed studies of the settlement of Wisconsin might have served as an example in that respect.—PAUL W. GATES.

THE LAW OF ZONING AND PLANNING. *C. A. and A. H. Rathkopf. Grosby Press. New York City. 1937. (\$7.50)*

Recent years have seen the development of the law of zoning and planning for the State of New York, but this is the first textbook to deal with this particular legislation and its correlative problems.

While the work has taken the form of a legal text for practicing attorneys, others interested in the subject will find here a valuable collection of relevant statutes and decisions interpreting them, and a guide to proper procedure in exercising the powers and duties given under this legislation.

{✓ *For your attention*

✓ THEY STARVE THAT WE MAY EAT—MIGRANTS OF THE CROPS. *Compiled by Edith E. Lowry. Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement. New York City, 1938.*

A realistic picture of the itinerant agricultural worker and his family, and a statement of the responsibility for this group shared by the Federal Government, the State, the church, and the individual.

✓ LAND UTILIZATION IN CHINA. *In Three Volumes. John Lossing Buck. Chicago University Press, Chicago, Ill. \$15.*

After 8 years of field investigation into 22 provinces, Dr. Buck presents this exhaustive and definitive study of China's agriculture, the livelihood of four-fifths of her teeming millions. Examining rural life, population, food supply, and standards of living, the treatise provides data from 17,000 farms in 168 localities—a collation which, in default of a farm census for the country, makes Dr. Buck's book perhaps the most authoritative guide extant to the Chinese economy.

✓ *A CHANCE FOR THE SHARECROPPER. Elizabeth C. Wherry. Wallace's Farmer. May 7, 1938. (Des Moines, Iowa.)*

A sympathetic description by an Iowa farm woman of the colony at Dyess, Ark., where the Government is helping stranded sharecropper families to build decent homes on better land and to achieve an economic self-sufficiency. Not without struggle, but with a sure progress, the colony has already secured for its residents many small homes, an administration building, a cafe for guests, a post office, a bank, a store, a school, churches, and a hospital.

✓ *THE MOVEMENT TO SOUTHERN FARMS, 1930-35. Conrad Taeuber. Rural Sociology. March 1938. (Franklin Press, Baton Rouge, La.)*

A study of the statistical relation between the South's high birth rates and its net emigration, and of the direction and flow of that exodus.

✓ *REGIONAL PLANNING, PART VII—ALASKA—ITS RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT. National Resources Committee, Alaska Resources Committee. December 1937. (Superintendent of Documents, Washington, 50 cents.)*

Though this report does not furnish a comprehensive plan for Alaska, it provides some basic factual data and staff reports, and considers (but does not finally answer) three major questions: (1) how has Alaska developed; (2) should that development be accelerated immediately; and (3) if so, what are the most advantageous lines to follow?

✓ *A SURVEY OF THE DEMAND FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOR IN OREGON. H. B. White, Oregon State Planning Board. Portland, Ore. December 1937.*

After an examination of 28 major field-crop and horticultural enterprises and 8 large livestock farms, and a statistical computation of their demand for seasonal labor, Mr. White hopefully describes a system whereby fairly accurate reports of labor requirements and labor supply can in the future be made to the relevant agencies.

✓ *THE COUNTY FORESTS OF WISCONSIN. Wisconsin Conservation Department. Madison, Wisconsin. 1938.*

Demonstrating clearly that the bulk of Wisconsin's county woodlands are unfit for farming, this pamphlet urges the State-wide setting up of county forests, in which the county owns the land, county residents take charge of their development, and county labor is used in planting and protecting the timber.

✓ *SHALL WE MOVE TO THE COUNTRY? University of Illinois Circular 479. December 1937. (College of Agriculture, Urbana, Ill.)*

After warning the unwisely hopeful that a small farm in the country may not be as cheap or as easy to run as they thought in the city, this circular goes on to explain to the stubborn precisely what problems are entangled in the successful organization and management of such a unit.

✓ **SQUARE DEAL FOR THE IOWA TENANT.** *Wallace's Farmer.* May 7, 1938. (*Des Moines, Iowa.*)

Anticipating the report of the farm tenancy committee appointed by Governor Kraschel of Iowa, the editors of *Wallace's Farmer* appraise the opinions aired by tenants and landlords during the hearings and in subsequent questionnaires. Though the editors believe that the committee will recommend national action on Iowa's tenancy problem, they outline three approaches which the State might embark upon by itself: (1) to pass State legislation improving agreements on lease-termination and unexhausted improvements; (2) to prevent a land boom by placing a heavy tax on profits from the sale of land; (3) to penalize holders of large blocks of land and thus force their sale to small farmers.

✓ **A STUDY OF MIGRATION INTO OREGON, 1930-37. VOL. I. NET MIGRATION AND POPULATION ESTIMATES.** *V. G. Stanberry.* February 1938. *Oregon State Planning Board.* (*Portland, Oreg.*)

Almost unnoticed by the public, a sizable migration into Oregon is taking place, Mr. Stanberry argues, and this influx is certain to bring about far-reaching economic and social changes. Though his bulletin consists largely of a statistical computation of the immigration, its volume, direction, composition, and aim, the author supplements his facts with a more informal consideration of the prospects facing these wanderers, and facing their host—Oregon.

✓ **THE PRESENT SOCIAL STATUS OF AMERICAN FARM TENANTS.** *Edgar A. Schuler.* *Rural Sociology.* March 1938. (*Franklin Press, Baton Rouge La.*)

From an analysis of 50 recent investigations of tenancy and class divisions, Mr. Schuler extracts his own general conclusions pointing to the existence of definite cleavages between tenants and owners on many significant questions—differences which are in turn crisscrossed by regional and racial variations.

✓ **BIBLIOGRAPHY ON LAND UTILIZATION, 1918-36.** *L. O. Bercaw and A. M. Hanny.* *U. S. D. A. Misc. Pub. 284,* January 1938. (*Superintendent of Documents, \$1.50.*)

This bibliography, compiled as a companion volume to that on Land Settlement issued in 1934, contains selected references to the literature published since the War on the economic aspects of land utilization and land policy in the United States and abroad.

✓ **A GRAPHIC SUMMARY OF FARM CROPS.** *O. E. Baker and A. B. Genung.* *U. S. D. A. Misc. Pub. 267.* March 1938. (*Government Printing Office, 15 cents.*)

To give a graphic view of the adjustments which our agricultural economy constantly undergoes, the authors have brought together a series of maps illustrating the shifts in crop acreage which have occurred to meet changing physical and economic conditions.

LAND POLICY REVIEW

Contents FOR JULY-AUGUST 1938

	Page
Migrants and Resettlement in the Pacific	
Coast States.	<i>Davis McEntire</i> 1
A New Lease for a New South	<i>John Baker</i> 7
The Farmer Turns Forester	<i>William S. Swingler</i> 11
Nonresident Ownership—Evil or Scapegoat? .	<i>Morris Evans</i> 15
Title III Purchase Program, 1938	<i>Hyman Bronfin</i> 21
The Program at Work:	
Indiana Projects Stimulate Local Action .	<i>J. B. Koblmeier</i> 22
Here and There	25
Books	27
For Your Attention	29

The Land Policy Review is published bimonthly by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. Subscriptions for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
5c single copy, 25 cents per year

